

SECRET

**JOURNAL**

**OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL**

**Wednesday - 19 June 1963**

25X1 1. [ ] Met with Mr. Cannon, at the Director's request, indicating to Mr. Cannon that the Director was most interested in the point raised by Mr. Cannon at the Monday meeting of the Subcommittee concerning review by the DCI of the budgets of other intelligence components. I indicated that the Director certainly wished to cooperate with the Subcommittee in this matter but would like Mr. Cannon to furnish his views on this subject in a letter. I pointed out to Mr. Cannon that from the Agency viewpoint the letter could be addressed to the Agency, to the Bureau of the Budget, or to the President as Mr. Cannon felt appropriate. Mr. Cannon stated that this was an important matter and he hoped that such review could eliminate possible duplications. He said he would be happy to prepare a letter on this subject and indicated he would send it to the Director. Mr. Cannon added that he felt the meeting on Monday had been most useful and I stated that we would be most happy to meet with him again in accordance with his request.

25X1 2. [ ] Talked with Robert Smart, House Armed Services Committee staff, indicating we were forwarding a letter to Mr. Vinsen regarding introduction of our proposed early retirement legislation. Smart said he thought this would be helpful.

Indicated to Robert Smart we were considering two other possible legislative items: (1) raising the number of retired officers under P. L. 118 from 15 to 50 and (2) amending the National Security Act to raise the present \$50 per day consultant fee to \$100 per day. Mr. Smart gave as his view that the retired officer legislation could be most difficult. In any event he made the strong point that no effort should be made to join these with retirement legislation since he assumed we regarded the retirement legislation as most important and, therefore, on principle other items should not be added to it and muddy the water.

SECRET